



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/052,800	10/29/2001	Stephen Harold Sanders III	CM04263H	3213

22917 7590 03/04/2005

MOTOROLA, INC.  
1303 EAST ALGONQUIN ROAD  
IL01/3RD  
SCHAUMBURG, IL 60196

EXAMINER

JAMAL, ALEXANDER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2643

DATE MAILED: 03/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 10/052,800	Applicant(s) SANDERS ET AL.	
	Examiner Alexander Jamal	Art Unit 2643	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 October 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2-5-2003</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. **Claims 1-9,14** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Reichelt et al. (6295447).

As per **claim 1**, Reichelt discloses a communication system (wired or wireless) comprising multiple communication devices (MS) and base stations (MSC). The base stations may be part of a packet-based network (Col 4 lines 44-55). The system comprises a service agent to manage the various services available to each communication device (MS) (ABSTRACT).

As per **claim 9**, claim rejected for same reasons as a method performed by the system of the claim 1 rejection. The service provider associated with each network node or base station and it's associated communication devices (MS) will request (such as by an action to trigger the 'TRUE' setting) and verify (such as by the 'ON' setting) various services (Col 2 lines 28-64)(Col 6 lines 25-37).

As per **claim 14**, claim rejected for same reasons as claim 9 rejection. The subscriber profile information stored in the HLR is used to notify the service provider (Col 5 line 55 to Col 6 line 11) as to whether the service should be provided to the communications device.

As per **claims 2-5**, the system uses a service management agent that is comprised of the software used to interface the mobile phones to the base stations. As such, the service management agent (software) is co-located with the communication devices, the base stations, and any additional equipment used by the service providers. The software inherently comprises a processor to run on for the purpose of signaling the hardware of the devices controlled by the software (Col 5 lines 1-35). Additionally, Reichelt discloses that the HLR (part of the service management agent) may be co-located with a given MSC or multiple MSC's (Col 1 lines 50-60). The HLR, along with the interface software used with the communication units comprise a service management agent that is spread out across the network.

As per **claims 6-8**, claims rejected for same reasons as claim 2 rejection. The HLR (part of the service management agent) may be located at an MSC (in which a second HLR would be located at another MSC), or may be co-located (with another HLR) at an MSC (Col 1 lines 50-60).

Art Unit: 2643

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 10,11,15,17-20**, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reichelt et al. (6295447) as applied to claims 9,14 above, and further in view of Rabe et al. (6138010).

As per **claims 10,15** Reichelt discloses applicant's claims 9,14 as mentioned above. Reichelt's system comprises setting and detecting various triggers (such as the 'TRUE' and 'ON' flags) in order to enable or disable services. Reichelt further discloses that the system may be used by an internet capable communication device (Col 9 lines 29-54). However, Reichelt does not disclose that one of the triggers is determining if another service is currently being provided to the MS, and if so, then determining if a triggered service has priority over a service currently being provided and if so, then interrupting the currently provided service.

Rabe discloses a wireless network in which the communication devices may access multiple modes (services) of communication from different service providers. Rabe teaches the phone should be compatible with multiple communication modes for the advantage that the phone may be used by a greater number of services at a reduced cost through the use of shared resources (ie. the phone antenna) (Col 1 line 55 to Col 2 line 30). Rabe further teaches a service management agent in the phone that determines if there is a current service in use (a positive or negative determination) (Col 6 lines 15-60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of this application to implement multiple service modes within the communication units for the advantage of being compatible with a greater number of service providers while reducing cost through the use of shared resources.

As per **claim 11**, Rabe's system will interrupt a current service for a new service based upon the priority for the services (Col 6 lines 15-60).

As per **claim 17**, Rabe discloses that a non-preferred (first) service provider notifies the communication device (via the service management agent) of a communication request (Col 6 lines 8-40). The appropriate service provider is enabled based upon the priority of the services.

As per **claim 18**, once a service is disabled it is made idle (RABE: Col 6 lines 30-40). Rabe further discloses that the service provider of the disabled service so that the service ceases to be provided (Col 11 lines 10-30).

As per **claim 19**, the service may be telephone calls.

As per **claim 20**, Rabe discloses that the first service may be deferred (halted until the current service has ended) (Col 6 lines 30-40).

5. **Claims 12,13**, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reichelt et al. (6295447) as applied to claims 9 above, and further in view of Giordano, III et al. (6285364).

As per **claim 12**, Reichelt discloses applicant's claim 9 as mentioned above.

Reichelt's system comprises setting and detecting various triggers (such as the 'TRUE' and 'ON' flags) in order to enable or disable services. Reichelt further discloses that the system may be used by an internet capable communication device (Col 9 lines 29-54).

However, Reichelt does not disclose that the service mode may be triggered by notifying the communication device user and allowing the user to decide which service should be made active.

Giordano discloses a mobile phone with both internet and telephone service (ABSTRACT). Giordano discloses a sliding display based on an incoming call that is displayed to the user by interrupting the display of a service currently being used (Col 2 lines 35-61). The service may be interrupted based upon manual intervention from the user. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of this application to implement the multiple service mode (telephone and internet) display screens selectable from the communications device (via the user) for the advantage of an improved display interface (Col 1 lines 35-65).

As per **claim 13**, claim rejected for the same reasons as the claim 12 rejection.

The 'second service provider request' may be an incoming telephone call to a phone while a user is currently accessing the internet.

6. **Claim 16** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reichelt et al. (6295447) as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of Mangal (6801519).

Art Unit: 2643


As per **claim 16**, Reichelt discloses applicant's claim 14. However, Reichelt does not disclose that one of the triggers for the services may be that the required bandwidth is within the system bandwidth available to the communication device.

Mangal discloses a communications system with allocated services in which a service management agent will check the quality of service (required bandwidth) before assigning the service (Col 6 lines 25-56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of this application to use the system bandwidth as a trigger in assigning services for the advantage of being able to control the quality of service provided to the user of the services without exceeding the characteristic bandwidth of the communications device.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alexander Jamal whose telephone number is 703-305-3433. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curtis A Kuntz can be reached on 703-305-4708. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications and 703-872-9315 for After Final communications.

AJ  
February 23, 2005

  
CURTIS KUNTZ  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600